

Application No. 09/656,166
Amendment dated February 17, 2006
After Final Office Action of January 17, 2006

Docket No.: 08223/000S102-US0

REMARKS

Claims 1-76, 78-80, and 82-99 are pending in this application. The final Office Action mailed October 19, 2005 and Advisory Action mailed January 17, 2006 rejected claims 1-76, 78-80, and 82-99. No claims have been amended in the present response. No new matter has been added. For the reasons discussed in detail below, Applicants submit that the pending claims are patentable over the references cited by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner pass this application to issue.

Telephonic Interview with the Examiner:

A telephone conference was held between Jamie Wiegand and the Examiner on February 15, 2006 to discuss the rejections of the Applicants' claims. During the conference, it was presented that U.S. Patent No. 6,141,686 to Jackowski et al ("Jackowski") neither teaches nor suggests examining the payload portion of the data to recognize a predefined data type as recited in the Applicants' claims. After a careful review, the Examiner responded, in a subsequent telephone call, that he agreed that the combination of references does not render the Applicants' claims obvious. Although this argument was submitted in the Applicants' response to the final office action mailed December 16, 2005, the Examiner requested that the argument be resubmitted in writing. In light of the Examiner's request, the following is submitted. The Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for his willingness to participate in the telephone conference after a final office and advisory action, and to review the rejections.

Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Wasilewski and Jackowski

The Office Action rejected claims 1-14, 16-21, 23-25, 29-30, 36, 39-40, 42, 48-50, 53-57, 61-63, 65-70, 73-76, 78-80, 84-89, and 94-97 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,420,866 to Wasilewski ("Wasilewski") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,141,686 to Jackowski et al ("Jackowski"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

{S:\08223\000S102US0\80052209.DOC *08223000S102US0* }2

Application No. 09/656,166
Amendment dated February 17, 2006
After Final Office Action of January 17, 2006

Docket No.: 08223/000S102-US0

The cited prior art references do not disclose or suggest all of the limitations of the amended claims. For example, Applicants respectfully disagree that Jackowski discloses or suggests determining if a payload portion is to be encrypted by examining the payload portion.

Instead, Jackowski describes an application-classifier plugin that intercepts network traffic at above the client's TCP/IP stack and associates applications and users with the network packets. (Jackowski, Abstract). Jackowski's interceptor is coupled between a high-level network socket library and a lower interface that formats data for transmission over the network. (See Jackowski, Col 4, lns. 51-59; See also Figures 4-5). An examiner is coupled to the interceptor. The examiner examines network events and collects information that includes a process identifier of a running instance of a high-level user application. (See Jackowski, Col 4, lns. 61- Col 5, lns. 1-6). Jackowski points out that such high-level applications (that are running on the client) send and receive information to a network by making calls to Winsock-2 library. These calls use an applications-programming interface (API). (Jackowski, Col 7, lns. 60-62). Events then are generated by the Winsock-2 library when a high-level application starts or ends, when it opens or closes a socket, when the connection state of the socket changed, and when data is sent or received. (Jackowski, Col 9, lns. 37-43). The unique process ID for the Winsock high-level applications that originated the event is stored. The name of the high-level application is retrieved using the Win32 API library call. (Jackowski, Col 10, lns. 58-64). Information about the high-level applications is stored in tables (current tables and historical tables). (Jackowski, Col 11, lns. 47-55; See also Figure 8).

Thus, as can be seen, Jackowski obtains information about network packets not by examining the payload portion of the data as claimed by the Applicants, but rather by monitoring high-level applications running on the client and events that employ the Winsock library. Jackowski examines its tables when an event is detected and makes a decision on how to manage the packets based on examining the tables to determine the high-level application associated with the packet. (Jackowski, Col 15, lns. 8-13; Col. 15, lns. 27-33; and Col. 16, lns. 1-4). Therefore, Jackowski does not examine the payload portion of the data as required by the claims. For at least these reasons, the cited references do make obvious the Applicants' claimed invention.

{S:\082223\000S102USO\80052209.DOC [XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX] } 3

Docket No.: 08223/000S102-US0

Furthermore, dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims from which the dependent claims depend. Accordingly, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of dependent Claims 2-14, 16, 18-21, 23-25, 29, 30, 39, 40, 42, 48-50, 54-57, 62, 63, 65, 66, 68-70, 74-76, 79, 80, 84, 85, 87-89, and 94-96 should also be withdrawn.

By the foregoing explanations, Applicants believe that this response has responded fully to all of the concerns expressed in the Office Action, and believes that it has placed each of the pending claims in condition for immediate allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. Should any further aspects of the application remain unresolved, the Examiner is invited to telephone applicant's attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

By Jamie L. Wiegand
 Jamie L. Wiegand
 Registration No.: 52,361
 DARBY & DARBY P.C.
 P.O. Box 5257
 New York, New York 10150-5257
 (206) 262-8900
 (212) 527-7701 (Fax)
 Attorneys/Agents For Applicant